A U M

Even though the truth be known, nevertheless this impress: "I am the actor, the experiencer," is deep-seated and powerful, as it is beginningless, the cause of circling birth and death. This impress is to be conquered by strong effort, through the vision of the Light in the Self. The sages have said that the attenuation of this impress is liberation.

—CREST JEWEL OF WISDOM.

THEOSOPHY

Vol. XXVII August, 1939 No. 10

THE SAME AND THE OTHER

WHAT lies between the adept and the ordinary man? As this question is answered, so will be the lifetime meditation of the aspiring human soul. As this mystery is understood, so will be the achievement of the disciple. What is the same in the Buddha and the sinner, and what is different?

Both are from the Eternal, and to That both will return, and therefore, it can not be Time that divides them. In both is the same Knower, the same changeless Essence; they are not two Selves, but one. Both are born in the same world, pass through the same sufferings, meet the same enjoyments, and both must die. Wherein are they different?

One man may say, The fulfillment of life comes slowly; it is an evolution; tomorrow, or after many days, I will become a Buddha. But the One Self does not revolve upon the wheel of time; how, then, shall its turning bring to man his Buddhahood?

Another thinks, The Self of All is unaffected by the ceaseless motion of this changing world; as I am That, I, too, shall withdraw to the motionless center of Life, and there become the Being which is Not-Being. But still men strive and women weep, and mortals suffer death. *Who is it that seeks this immutability?*

Men are compounds of the Imperishable, yet all compounds are perishable. This is the great Mystery. Does a man consider suffering only when *he* suffers? Across a world a nation rises, after a time of blood and tears, to a time of hate and destruction: it is himself writ large. Does a man give over to his longing for peace and bliss—for *him*? Somewhere a civilization returns to barbarism; its Manasa have looked for quiet places, and found them. Does he think that there are *men* who are the Enemy, besides the demons

crouched about his heart? Does he think the devils in himself are *his?* That man has not even begun his true evolution.

What in us frets at human weakness, bewails that things are not other than they are? Who is it that would make over mankind in his own image? Surely not Buddha. There is only *One* who has the right to aspire for others, and that One is without Being or Change. "The Eternal is the sum of being, the sum of consciousness, everlasting, the sum of bliss, without action, one, verily, and secondless; in the Eternal there is no diversity."

Wherever a man has lost himself in Self, there is a Living God. Be he murderer, thief or sot, in that moment when he has forgot that *he* is serving his fellows, in him is the Buddha born. Out of the timeless past, through the Mayavic present to the endlessness of tomorrow, the many selves have come and move. But the Self does not move; IT IS. That which becomes is not the Self, yet the Self is in that which becomes. Can anyone become greater than the Self? Those who count the rushing years must think so. Is anyone less than the Self? The human heart torn on the rack of resistless regret believes that it is less.

Why are we sometimes kind? Because the Self is One. Why are we sometimes harsh? Because the selves are many. Why is a Buddha Buddha-like? Because the self is Self. What is a human being? It is Self thinking sometimes of Self, sometimes of selves.

What is this Mind, where dwell the Self and selves? Who is this thinker who sees in space, but never sees Dimension; who adds, subtracts and multiplies, yet never measures Number? The Self is impartite, yet everywhere there are parts. What are they?

The Self as Self moves all, feels all, knows all. The Self as selves moves some, feels partially, knows something. The Self rejects nothing because it is everything. Selves have hopes and fears, likes and desires, knowledge and ignorance. The Self accepts all these things because Being and Becoming are as much the Self as Not-Being and Rest. When selves accept these things, not as selves, but as the Self accepts them, then they will *be* the Self.

How does the Self act? One thing we know, It does not act for self. Yet the Self acts only through selves. Only when the knots of the heart in selves are untied, can Self act through them. What is this Life born from the death of self? What is the life that dies for Self? What is the difference between god and man? Only the god in man can say.

ANCIENT LANDMARKS

PLATO

ONE night in the year 407 B. C., Socrates had a dream. He saw a graceful white swan flying toward him with a melodious song trilling from its throat. The next morning Plato came to him and asked to become his pupil. Socrates saw before him a handsome youth of twenty years, with the broad shoulders of an athlete, the noble brow of a philosopher and the limpid eyes of a poet. He knew that Plato belonged to one of the most illustrious families of Greece, being descended, on his mother's side, from the house of Solon, and with the blood of the ancient Kings of Attica flowing through his veins. This was the beginning of a tender and intimate relationship which lasted until the day of Socrates' death. While other pupils formulated one-sided systems which but partially represented the ideas of Socrates, Plato used those ideas as seeds which he planted, nourished and developed in the rich soil of his own superior mind, making the full-blown blossoms a memorial offering to the simple nobility of his teacher.

After the death of Socrates, Plato went to Megara and joined the Socratic School of Euclid (not the famous geometer, who lived in Alexandria in the time of Ptolemy I, but a disciple of Socrates who excelled in logical disputation). From there he went to Cyrene, where Theodorus instructed him in mathematics. Thence to southern Italy, where he studied the science of numbers under the three most famous Pythagoreans of the day. Then into Egypt, to receive the instructions of the learned doctors and priests of that ancient land. Some say that he visited Persia and Babylonia, where he was initiated into the Chaldean Mysteries. Others say that he went as far as India.

Plato claimed no originality for his ideas. He was, in every sense, the world's interpreter. He, like H. P. B., gave a new unity to ancient and scattered truths—his work was the string which tied together the nosegay of precious blossoms which had been culled from the gardens of the world's best thinkers. Without Plato, the Socratic method of education would be unknown. Without Plato, the abstruse numerical system of Pythagoras would have remained unintelligible to the average mind. Without Plato, the philosophical and psychological systems of Patanjali, Kapila and Vyasa, the laws of Manu and the Buddhistic doctrine of emanation, would have remained hidden from the Western world. Plato was the link be-

tween the East and the West. As Emerson says, "The excellence of Europe and Asia is in his brain. Metaphysics and natural philosophy expressed the genius of Europe; he substructs the religion of Asia as the base."

As an Initiate of the Mysteries, Plato was obliged to veil many of his more abstruse teachings in symbolical language. His great veneration for the Mysteries and the responsibility he felt toward them made him guard their inmost secrets with jealous care. Once, when he was accused of making a vague communication, he answered, "I *purposely* spoke enigmatically, that in case the tablet should have happened with any accident, a person without some previous knowledge of the subject might not be able to understand its contents." He communicated his most profound teachings orally and only to his initiated disciples, who in turn passed them down from generation to generation of similarly pledged disciples.

After travelling for ten or twelve years, Plato returned to Athens and founded a School in the gardens of his own private estate. This School attracted students from every part of the Hellenic world and eventually became the educational center of Greece. His mode of teaching combined the conversational method of Socrates, the system of discourse used by the ordinary university professor, and the mental and moral discipline of the Mystery Schools. His instruction, needless to say, was given without remuneration.

Music was the first subject presented to his pupils, as Plato believed that the study of this art offers the best preparation for philosophy. "Musical training," he said, "is a more potent instrument than any other, because rhythm and harmony find their way into the inward places of the soul, on which they mightily fasten." To this he added gymnastics, insisting, however, that even physical exercise should be performed for the benefit of the soul, since the soul demands a temple worthy of its occupancy. The combination of music and gymnastics, he said, produces a harmonious balance between soul and body. Physical training develops courage and fortitude; music develops a love of the beautiful, and affords the mental and moral discipline necessary to the acquirement of philosophical knowledge. He considered music, however, as the more important of the two, describing it as the fortress of the State. He warned all intelligent rulers to pay careful attention to the development of music in their state, never allowing bad qualities to creep into it, as these would affect the mental and moral stamina of the citizens who listened to it. Finally he insisted that all art be subordinated to ethics and used as a means of moral education.

Plato presented his philosophy in the form of dramatic dialogue. He spreads the charm of an exhaustless fancy over the subtle controversies of his characters, filling them with humor, exuberant imagery, delicate sarcasm and friendly banter. Throughout his lines, however, runs the unbroken thread of a deep and penetrating philosophy based upon Dialectics, which he considered as the science of all sciences. Starting with universal principles and descending therefrom into particulars, he developed a system of thought which embraced the evolution of worlds and species, the correlation and conservation of forces, the development and transmutation of physical forms, the indestructibility of both spirit and matter.

Plato knew that the Higher Self in man is concerned with causes rather than effects. It is the presence of this Higher Self which makes a man ask the immediate cause of a certain effect, then for the cause of that, until he finally arrives at that Cause which lies behind all others. Although postulating the existence of this Causeless Cause, Plato wisely refrained from any description of its nature. The Theosophical student, however, will recognize in Plato's "Unchangeable Existence" the "Be-ness" of *The Secret Doctrine,* the SAT of Eastern philosophy which at stated intervals becomes the cause of the Becoming.

Barely mentioning this Absolute Negation, Plato started by considering its two aspects, which constitute the basis of conditioned existence. He described the universal substratum of primordial substance as the "Unlimited," considering it as that indefinable "Something" from which all forms of matter emanate and into which they will eventually return. "That in which all things appear, grow up and disappear is *Space*," he said, at the same time making it clear that Space is animated by eternal, ceaseless Motion. He did not conceive this Motion, however, as a blind, unreasoning force, but identified it with Deity, tracing the word *theos* back to a verb meaning "to move."

Plato taught that the visible universe is but the concrete image of an ideal abstraction, built on the model of the first Divine Idea. We find him distinctly stating that everything was evolved out of the eternal and invisible WILL, which contains within itself the Idea of the world to be created, the Idea being produced out of itself. He declared that behind all existences and secondary causes, behind all laws, ideas and principles, there is *Intelligence.* This is the Universal Mind in its Cosmic aspect, reflecting itself as the Higher Ego in man.

The immortality of the soul forms the central theme of Plato's philosophy. In his *Phaedo* he unfolds all the arguments in favor of this premise, and refutes all objections. He shows that the soul is neither dependent upon the body for its existence nor affected by its dissolution. With irrefutable logic he demonstrates the necessity for reincarnation, and shows that knowledge itself is nothing more than *reminiscence.* The doctrine of Karma runs like a golden thread throughout his writings. Although admitting that man is seemingly the victim of circumstances, he proves that in reality man is their master.

The Theosophical student of Plato is sometimes confused by the different terms used in describing the various aspects of the soul. What Theosophy calls *Buddhi,* Plato describes as the rational spiritual soul, defining it as the "motion that is able to move itself." When he says that "soul is the most ancient of all things," he is referring to *Atma-Buddhi.* When he speaks of the *nous* in man, he is describing *Manas,* the reincarnating Ego. Sometimes Plato divides the soul into two parts, at other times into three. His twofold division of soul refers to the dual *Manas,* the higher part being divine and immortal, the lower material and perishable. The Theosophical student understands this statement, for he knows that the lower, personal "astral soul" perishes after the death of the body as the *Kama-Rupa,* while the incorruptible "Spiritual Soul," or *Buddhi-Manas,* becomes more purified with each incarnation.

Following the method used in the Mysteries, Plato's pupils began their discipline by trying to purify the *external* soul, or astral body. If that is purified, it strengthens the lower mind, or the "mortal soul." Thus strengthened, the lower mind naturally gravitates toward its "Father," of which it is a ray. Plato promised his pupils that this form of discipline would eventually free them from the bonds of sense. But he also warned them that if this discipline were neglected and the soul allowed to sink deeper and deeper into matter, the time would come when the soul itself would be lost.

Although Plato is not renowned as a scientist, a careful analysis of his writings will reveal the germs of many "modern" discoveries. For instance, he taught that gravitation is not merely the law of the attraction of lesser bodies to greater, but a magnetic repulsion of similars and attraction of dissimilars. Although Aristotle taught that the world is the center of the universe, Plato, the Pythagorean, was well versed in the heliocentric system. Antedating Paracelsus by 2,000 years, Plato traced all diseases back to their psychological

causes. He hinted at the secret teachings concerning the earlier races upon this globe, describing the "winged" and androgynous races which "preceded the earthly human race, in which the primitive history was gradually forgotten and men sank deeper and deeper." He likewise mentioned the various deluges which have destroyed former continents, and in *Timaeus* and *Critias* gives a detailed description of the last island-remnant of Atlantis, which sank some 9,000 years before he was born.

Plato's philosophy is ethical above all else, based upon the idea of man's free will and power of choice. He claims that it is this power of choice which determines a man's parentage, his hereditary tendencies, his physical constitution and his early education, since all of these things are merely the effects of choices made in former lives. These choices also determine the man's stage of evolution, show the position he should occupy in the well-ordered state, and indicate the particular virtue necessary for his immediate development. The whole problem of evolution, according to Plato, is one of *ethics*. As the ultimate aim of every man is to free himself from the tyranny of his lower nature, and as this can be accomplished only through the efforts of the individual, each man must start where he is, and develop that virtue which is most necessary for him.

The natural inequalities among men, due to their past choices, divides them, in Plato's view, into three classes. The first class lives in its sensations. The particular virtue to be developed by this class of people is temperance, or moderation. The second class is entangled in its passional nature. These people are the slaves of their pains and pleasures, their hopes and fears. They must develop courage and fortitude, virtues which will enable them to meet all the vicissitudes of life with an equal mind. The third and highest class is made up of those men who have gained control over their lower nature and who live naturally in the higher mind. These men should aspire to wisdom, or spiritual knowledge.

After analyzing the three divisions of the soul and the three classes of individuals who correspond to them, Plato then turns his attention to the State, which is merely a collection of individuals. The ideal state, he says, should be divided up into three classes of citizens, each class having its own particular duty to be performed and its special virtue to be developed. When each class concentrates upon its own duty and virtue, there will result a well-balanced and harmonious state in which all the citizens will work, not for the interests of itself, but for the common good of the whole.

The lowest class in Plato's ideal state is composed of those men whose interests are centered in their sensations. These are the laborers and artisans, whose immediate task is to acquire skill in action upon the physical plane. The second class is composed of those men who, having dominant passional natures, are constantly at war in themselves. Plato would make these men the warriors of the nation, thus giving them the opportunity to develop the courage and fortitude necessary at their stage of evolution. The ruling class is made up of those men who have learned how to govern themselves, and are therefore fitted to govern others. As he says in the *Republic,* "unless philosophers become rulers or rulers become true and thorough students of philosophy, there will be no end to the troubles of states and of humanity."

Plato's ideal state was modelled after the form of government which prevailed in the Golden Age, when the young and growing nations were governed by wise King-Initiates. But nations, like children, grow up and must learn to do their own thinking; they must assume their own responsibilties. From this necessity democracy grew. The fact that Adepts stood behind the founding of the American Republic shows that the ideal form of government at the present day must be the government of a people by the people and for the people. It is obvious, however, that the men who are elected to stand at the head of affairs should be drawn from among those citizens who have proven that they are able to govern themselves, and are therefore fitted to govern others. The men who stand at the head of democratic governments should be the first to bravely and fearlessly uphold the principles of true democracy. Their lives should also be examples of the highest morality, a living pattern which others may safely follow. Thus might Plato's ideal be fulfilled in our time.

PLATO'S GOD-IDEA

Between Pantheism and Fetichism, we have been repeatedly told, there is but an insignificant step. Plato was a Monotheist, it is asserted. In one sense, he was that, most assuredly; but his Monotheism never led him to the worship of one *personal* God, but to that of a Universal Principle and to the fundamental idea that the absolutely immutable or unchangeable Existence alone, really *is,* all the finite existences and change being only appearance, *i. e.,* Mâyâ.

—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

ASPECTS OF TRUTH

THE whole of Life is but the drama of the Soul. The purpose of this endless stream of conditioned existence is the coming into manifestation of both Spirit and Matter; their action and interaction produce the infinite degrees of Be-ing, differentiated within the eternal Be-ness.

The ever-attainable yet ever receding goal of these periodical cycles of activity is the complete expression of the Spirit aspect of Life through the Matter aspect, and, for self-conscious man, the realization of his oneness with the immutable Unity underlying the apparent diversity of conditioned existence.

This realization is called in *The Secret Doctrine, Paranishpanna* —"the absolute perfection to which all existences attain at the close of a great period of activity, or Maha-Manvantara, and in which they rest during the succeeding period of repose. . . . It is absolute, however, only in a relative sense, for it must give room to still further absolute perfection, according to a higher standard of excellence in the following period of activity—just as a perfect flower must cease to be a perfect flower and die, in order to grow into a perfect fruit, . . . this stupendous development has neither conceivable beginning nor imaginable end." (I, 42-3.)

Through the intelligence inherent within Life, the evolutionary urge accomplishes the transition from chaos to kosmos. This universal intelligence, which establishes the relation between spirit and matter, is the third aspect of Life—that from which man derives his individualized mind, his I-am-I consciousness.

St. Paul names this trinity Spirit, Soul, Body. Theology calls it Father, Son, Holy Ghost. In other terms, it is Spirit, Mind, Matter.

Life, in its simplest condition, is at least dual. It has a physical and a metaphysical aspect, an inner nature and an outer nature. Any knowledge that hopes to be complete must take cognizance of both these aspects of Life. That which cognizes is the third aspect. From this trinitarian basis come three approaches to knowledge: True Religion, which is the study of the Unity of Life; True Philosophy, which is the study of the purpose of Life; and True Science, which is the study of the processes or mechanics of Life.

But these three are approaches, and no more. To reach and encompass Knowledge, the perceptions gained by all three must be synthesized by spiritual triangulation.

"The synthesis of Science, Religion, and Philosophy" is the Secret Doctrine.

PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS

THE doctrines of Theosophy are never found to be in contradiction with the experiences of men; why, then, can we not learn all we need to know from "experience" itself? To answer this question we need to consider how very restricted are the fields of experience of individual men. The Hindu miracle-worker may be quite incapable of "reading, writing and 'rithmetic," not having attended a western elementary school, while occidentals believe that mind control and powers are superstitions, and may live out their lives completely untouched by any contact with this side of nature. Literary critics are not expected to solve engineering problems, nor are chemists thought any the less of because they cannot produce a fine painting. The approach to each of these expressions of man's life requires a differing play of the senses, and that is why individual philosophies based on personal experience during one short life disagree so widely. Theosophy alone excludes no man's views or experiences, but lays down principles broad enough to reconcile all.

The teachings of the after-death states and of reincarnation are not the fabrications of fancy. They are based on actual experience and also upon historical instances scientifically established, but ignored by western science and religion because they upset theory or dogma. Theosophists have a very precious possession in their knowledge that "There is no religion higher than truth." There is no religion or science worth the name which can blandly ignore certain *facts* and expect to deal intelligently with other facts. Nor is there any room in Theosophy for believers. But the theosophist who "has his doubts" has failed to note that H. P. B. asked only that Theosophical propositions be taken as working hypotheses. If they don't *work,* let them be discarded. Unless they are founded on fact, let them be buried with other dogmas.

Real searchers for truth have found that every step of the way has been indicated in the works of H. P. B., but no one can do our "walking" for us. It must be repeated over and over again that the textbooks of Theosophy are like those of algebra or chemistry, or any science. The seeming "miracles" at the end of the way are no miracles to those who have worked out each step as they went along. These wonders might be scoffed at as superstitions by the layman, but he would deliberately have to ignore facts to preserve this attitude. Just as the chemist shows us his piece of synthetic

silk to prove his words, so H. P. B. points to hundreds of records and witnesses—authorities quoted by chapter and verse—not to convince us or have us believe, but rather to encourage us to work it out for ourselves. The mysteries of life and the mysteries of death are profound studies. Uniquely on this terrestrial globe, it is man who concerns himself with their solution. We are distinguished from the animals in facing these problems, in our complex agonies over right and wrong—in all our mental and moral activities. Theosophy would have us continue in our role of Man; we are encouraged to treasure that which distinguishes us from the animal, to improve the human and reach to divinity.

Naturally, our habits of living are of utmost importance in the matter of study and self-study. Only a persistent striving to know the truth of our experiences can enable us to make correct decisions as to how we should act. Einstein has been able to work out his theories not merely by mathematics. His whole life has been disciplined to hard work. If our aim in life is eating, drinking, and merriment, we will spend our time and thought and energy toward this end. The exercise, food and sleep of the athlete take their place in his life toward the acquisition of physical skill and strength. So also in the development of the moral man. The life habits should be so established and controlled that they do not conflict with but *serve* the aim we have set for ourselves. This means the unification of our nature—a brotherhood of the lives, the principles, within the individual.

A little pamphlet entitled "How to Study" is on sale at university book stores. The writer wisely precedes instructions on how to study with instructions on *how to live*. There is the need for regular sleep, fresh air, nourishing food, sufficient water. Then comes the choice of a regular time for study. To combat distractions at this hour, we should have a special place, and there the materials we work with all at hand to remind us of our purpose. The preparation of the mind consists in a renunciation of external results, such as worry over the grading mark we shall receive, or anxiety to imitate a procedure which happens to have gained someone's approval. Instead we avow our interest in the subject *per se,* our own desire to become acquainted with the subject, to master it. We are to recognize the job as essentially that of independent thinking, and not for someone's approbation, or "marks." With body composed and mind alert, the student is now ready to begin his studies.

Sometimes students lament that in spite of many resolutions, they have not yet commenced serious study of *The Secret Doctrine.*

These might try applying the counsel given regarding "a certain time and place" for study. After this cycle is established, we can do all the supplementing we want to, snatching time spent on a street car, in waiting rooms, or during a lapse in the day's occupation. "Behind will lies desire," and we must use the desire to good effect whenever we can, else it will die. We need to note, not that we sometimes fail, but always *why* we fail. Too much reading is one person's destroyer of resolutions, just as too much talking or too much attachment to a routine task is the Waterloo of others. If while reading we are inspired to *do* such and such, let us lay down the book and work out the thought. Otherwise, when the book is finished, while many ideas will have come, they also will have *gone*!

Let us affirm our reverence of the divine being within, who has the power to start and to stop any occupation or tendency. Let us exercise our soul-powers, being glad of our questions and human problems, facing experience fully awake and ready. The weak way is frustration, evasion, forgetfulness. The strong way is always on the upgrade, choosing that turn which goes ahead.

THE CHAIN OF BEING

He who would be an occultist must not separate either himself or anything else from the rest of creation or *non-creation*. For, the moment he distinguishes himself from even a vessel of dishonour, he will not be able to join himself to any vessel of honour. He must think of himself as an infinitesimal something, not even as an individual atom, but as a part of the world-atoms as a whole, or become an illusion, a nobody, and vanish like a breath leaving no trace behind. As illusions, we are separate disinct bodies, living in masks furnished by Maya. Can we claim one single atom in our body as distinctly our own? Everything from spirit to the tiniest particle, is part of the whole, at best a link. Break a single link and all passes into annihilation; but this is impossible. There is a series of vehicles becoming more and more gross, from spirit to the densest matter, so that with each step downward and outward we get more and more the sense of separateness developed in us. Yet this is illusory, for if there were a real and complete separation between any two human beings, they could not communicate with, or understand each other in any way. —*Transactions.*

LIFE AND DEATH

By H. P. BLAVATSKY

[Section IX of *The Key To Theosophy* is devoted to a consideration of Kama-Loka and Devachan, the states of consciousness intervening between two earthly existences of the reincarnating Ego, or immortal spiritual Man—states to which the human being may rise or sink while alive in the body, but from which return after death is impossible except via a new incarnation. In this fact lies the true understanding of spiritualism, psychism, and many other ranges of phenomena connected with the "astral body"—so-called. In a footnote at page 157 of the original edition of the *Key,* H. P. B. refers to an article of hers entitled "Dialogue on the Mysteries of the After Life," originally published in *Lucifer* for January, 1889. This was preceded by the publication in *Lucifer* for December, 1888 (the month before), of another article on the same general subject, entitled "Dialogues between the Two Editors." The "Two Editors" were at that time H. P. B. herself and Mabel Collins, "transcriber" of *Light on the Path.* After January, 1889, Mabel Collins was dropped from the editorial staff of *Lucifer*—the reason being the storm which soon became public in which Professor Elliot Coues was the arch-conspirator, Mabel Collins his willing victim, M. A. Lane a go-between, and the *Religio-Philosophical Journal,* M. A. Bundy editor, the means of publicity.

These two "Dialogues" were an attempt by H. P. B. to put students on their guard and give them right direction in their study of the after-death states. The two articles were reprinted in THEOSOPHY for November and December, 1914, and extra copies are still available.

But H. P. B. wrote still a third article on the same thesis, and this she withheld from publication. It was published in *Lucifer* for September, 1892, more than a year after her death. Why did H. P. B. keep back this article from publication at the same time as the other two? Would a comparison of them show her reason? The Movement has just passed its "climacteric year" and the third generation from the Founders is entering upon its responsibilities. The time seems now at hand to make public to the coming generation this important article on "Life and Death." We therefore reprint it herewith.—Editors, THEOSOPHY.]

MASTER," said Narayan to Thakur, in the midst of a very hot dispute with the poor Babu, "what is it he is saying, and can one listen to him without being disgusted? He says that nothing remains of the man after he is dead, but that the body of the man simply resolves itself into its component elements, and that what we call the soul, and he calls the temporary consciousness,

separates itself, disappearing like the steam of hot water as it cools."

"Do you find this so very astonishing?" said the Master. "The Babu is a Chârvâka[1] and he tells you only that which every other Chârvâka would have told you."

"But the Chârvâkas are mistaken. There are many people who believe that the real man is not his physical covering, but dwells in the mind, in the seat of consciousness. Do you mean to say that in any case the consciousness may leave the soul after death?"

"In *his* case it may," answered Thakur quietly: "because he firmly believes in what he says."

Narayan cast an astonished and even frightened look at Thakur, and the Babu—who always felt some restraint in the presence of the latter—looked at us with a victorious smile.

"But how is this?" went on Narayan. "The Vedânta teaches us that the spirit of the spirit is immortal, and that the human soul does not die in Parabrahman. Are there any exceptions?"

"In the fundamental laws of the spiritual world there can be no exceptions; but there are laws for the blind and laws for those who see."

"I understand this, but in this case, as I have told him already, his full and final disappearance of consciousness is nothing but the aberration of a blind man, who, not seeing the sun, denies its existence, but all the same he will see the sun with his spiritual sight after he is dead."

"He will not see anything," said the Master. "Denying the existence of the sun now, he could not see it on the other side of the grave."

Seeing that Narayan looked rather upset, and that even we, the Colonel and myself, stared at him in the expectation of a more definite answer, Thakur went on reluctantly:

"You speak about the spirit of the spirit, that is to say about the Atmâ, confusing this spirit with the soul of the mortal, with Manas. No doubt the spirit is immortal, because being without beginning it is without end; but it is not the spirit that is concerned in the present conversation. It is the human, self-conscious soul. You confuse it with the former, and the Babu denies the one and the other, soul and spirit, and so you do not understand each other."

"I understand him," said Narayan.

"But you do not understand me," interrupted the Master. "I will try to speak more clearly. What you want to know is this. Whether

[1] A sect of Bengali Materialists.

the full loss of consciousness and self-feeling is possible after death, even in the case of a confirmed Materialist. Is that it?"

Narayan answered: "Yes; because he fully denies everything that is an undoubted truth for us, that in which we firmly believe."

"All right," said the Master. "To this I will answer positively as follows, which, mind you, does not prevent me from believing as firmly as you do in our teaching, which designates the period between two lives as only temporary. Whether it is one year or a million that this *entr'acte* lasts between the two acts of the illusion of life, the posthumous state may be perfectly similar to the state of a man in a very deep fainting-fit, without any breaking of the fundamental rules. Therefore the Babu in his personal case is perfectly right."

"But how is this?" said Colonel Olcott; "since the rule of immortality does not admit of any exceptions, as you said."

"Of course it does not admit of any exceptions, but only in the case of things that really exist. One who like yourself has studied *Mândukya Upanishad* and *Vedânta-sara* ought not to ask such questions," said the Master with a reproachful smile.

"But it is precisely *Mândukya Upanishad,*" timidly observed Narayan, "which teaches us that between the Buddhi and the Manas, as between the Ishvara and Prajñâ, there is no more difference in reality than between a forest and its trees, between a lake and its waters."

"Perfectly right," said the Master, "because one or even a hundred trees which have lost their vital sap, or are even uprooted, cannot prevent the forest from remaining a forest."

"Yes," said Narayan, "but in this comparison, Buddhi is the forest, and Manas Taijasi the trees, and if the former be immortal, then how is it possible for the Manas Taijasi, which is the same as Buddhi, to lose its consciousness before a new incarnation? That is where my difficulty lies."

"You have no business to have any difficulties," said the Master, "if you take the trouble not to confuse the abstract idea of the whole with its casual change of form. Remember that if in talking about Buddhi we may say that it is unconditionally immortal, we cannot say the same either about Manas, or about Taijasi. Neither the former nor the latter have any existence separated from the Divine Soul, because the one is an attribute of the terrestrial personality, and the second is identically the same as the first, only with the additional reflection in it of the Buddhi. In its turn, Buddhi would

be an impersonal spirit without this element, which it borrows from the human soul, and which conditions it and makes out of it something which has the appearance of being separate from the Universal Soul, during all the cycle of the man's incarnations. If you say therefore that Buddhi-Manas cannot die, and cannot lose consciousness either in eternity or during the temporary periods of suspension, you would be perfectly right; but to apply this axiom to the qualities of Buddhi-Manas is the same as if you were arguing that as the soul of Colonel Olcott is immortal the red on his cheeks is also immortal. And so it is evident you have mixed up the reality, Sat, with its manifestation. You have forgotten that united to the Manas only, the luminosity of Taijasi becomes a question of time, as the immortality and the posthumous consciousness of the terrestrial personality of the man become conditional qualities, depending on the conditions and beliefs created by itself during its lifetime. Karma acts unceasingly, and we reap in the next world the fruit of that which we ourselves have sown in this life."

"But if my Ego may find itself after the destruction of my body in a state of complete unconsciousness, then where is the punishment for the sins committed by me in my lifetime?" asked the Colonel, pensively stroking his beard.

"Our Philosophy teaches us," answered Thakur, "that the punishment reaches the Ego only in its next incarnation, and that immediately after our death we meet only the rewards for the sufferings of the terrestrial life, sufferings that were not deserved by us. So, as you may see, the whole of the punishment *consists in the absence of reward, in the complete loss of the consciousness of happiness and rest.* Karma is the child of the terrestrial Ego, the fruit of the acts of his visible personality, even of the thoughts and intentions of the spiritual I. But at the same time it is a tender mother, who heals the wounds given in the preceding life before striking this Ego and giving him new ones. In the life of a mortal there is no mishap or sorrow which is not a fruit and direct consequence of a sin committed in his preceding incarnation; but not having preserved the slightest recollection of it in his present life, and not feeling himself guilty, and therefore suffering unjustly, the man deserves consolation and full rest on the other side of the grave. For our spiritual Ego Death is always a redeemer and a friend. It is either the peaceful sleep of a baby, or a sleep full of blissful dreams and reveries."

"As far as I remember, the periodical incarnations of Sûtrâtmâ[2] are compared in the Upanishads to the terrestrial life which is spent, term by term, in sleeping and waking. Is that so?" I asked, wishing to renew the first question of Narayan.

"Yes, it is so; that is a very good comparison."

"I do not doubt it is good," I said, "but I hardly understand it. After the awakening, the man merely begins a new day, but his soul, as well as his body, are the same as they were yesterday; whereas in every new incarnation not only his exterior, sex, and even personality, but, as it seems to me, all his moral qualities, are changed completely. And then, again, how can this comparison be called true, when people, after their awakening, remember very well not only what they were doing yesterday, but many days, months, and even years ago, whereas, in their present incarnations, they do not preserve the slightest recollection about any past life, whatever it was. Of course a man, after he is awakened, may forget what he has seen in his dreams, but still he knows that he was sleeping and that during his sleep he lived. But about our previous life we cannot say even that we lived. What do you say to this?"

"There are some people who do remember some things," enigmatically answered Thakur, without giving a straight answer to my question.

"I have some suspicions on this point," I answered, laughingly, "but it cannot be said about ordinary mortals. Then how are we, who have not reached as yet the Samma Sambuddha,[3] to understand this comparison?"

"You can understand it when you better understand the characteristics of the three kinds of what we call sleep."

"This is not an easy task you propose to us," said the Colonel, laughingly. "The greatest of our physiologists got so entangled in this question that it became only more confused."

"It is because they have undertaken what they had no business to undertake, the answering of this question being the duty of the psychologist, of whom there are hardly any among your European scientists. A Western psychologist is only another name for a physi-

---

[2] In the Vedânta, Buddhi in its combinations with the moral qualities, consciousness, and the notions of the personalities in which it was incarnated, is called Sûtrâmâ, which literally means the "thread soul," because a whole long row of human lives is strung on this thread like the pearls of a necklace. The Manas must become Taijasi in order to reach and to see itself in eternity, when united to Sûtrâtmâ. But often, owing to sin and associations with the purely terrestrial reason, this very luminosity disappears completely.

[3] The knowledge of one's past incarnations. Only Yôgis and Adepts of the Occult Sciences possess this knowledge, by the aid of the most ascetic life.

ologist, with the difference that they work on principles still more material. I have recently read a book by Maudsley which showed me clearly that they try to cure mental diseases without believing in the existence of the soul."

"All this is very interesting," I said, "but it leads us away from the original object of our questions, which you seem reluctant to clear for us, Thakur Sahib. It looks as if you were confirming and even encouraging the theories of the Babu. Remember that he says he disbelieves the posthumous life, the life after death, and denies the possibility of any kind of consciousness exactly on the grounds of our not remembering anything of our past terrestrial life."

"I repeat again that the Babu is a Châr vâka, who only repeats what he was taught. It is not the system of the Materialists that I confirm and encourage, but the truth of the Babu's opinions in what concerns his personal state after death."

"Then do you mean to say that such people as the Babu are to be excepted from the general rule?"

"Not at all. Sleep is a general and unchangeable law for man as well as for every other terrestrial creature, but there are various sleeps and still more various dreams."

"But it is not only the life after death and its dreams that he denies. He denies the immortal life altogether, as well as the immortality of his own spirit."

"In the first instance he acts according to the canons of modern European Science, founded on the experience of our five senses. In this he is guilty only with respect to those people who do not hold his opinions. In the second instance again he is perfectly right. Without the previous interior consciousness and the belief in the immortality of the soul, the soul cannot become Buddhi Taijasi. It will remain Manas. But for the Manas alone there is no immortality. *In order to live a conscious life in the world on the other side of the grave, the man must have acquired belief in that world, in this terrestrial life.* These are the two aphorisms of the Occult Science, on which is constructed all our Philosophy in respect to the posthumous consciousness and immortality of the Soul. Sûtrâtmâ gets only what it deserves. After the destruction of the body there begins for the Sûtrâtmâ either a period of full awakening, or a chaotic sleep, or a sleep without reveries or dreams. Following your physiologists who found the causality of dreams in the unconscious preparation for them in the waking state, why should not we acknowledge the same with respect to the posthumous dreams? I repeat what Vedânta Sara teaches us: *Death is sleep.* After death,

there begins before our spiritual eyes a representation of a programme that was learned by heart by us in our lifetime, and was sometimes invented by us, the practical realization of our true beliefs, or of illusions created by ourselves. These are the posthumous fruit of the tree of life. Of course the belief or disbelief in the fact of conscious immortality cannot influence the unconditioned actuality of the fact itself once it exists. But the belief or disbelief of separate personalities cannot but condition the influence of this fact in its effect on such personalities. Now I hope you understand."

"I begin to understand. The Materialists, disbelieving everything that cannot be controlled by their five senses and their so-called scientific reason and denying every spiritual phenomenon, point to the terrestrial as the only conscious existence. Accordingly they will get only what they have deserved. They will lose their personal I; they will sleep the unconscious sleep until a new awakening. Have I understood rightly?"

"Nearly. You may add to that that the Vedântins, acknowledging two kinds of conscious existence, the terrestrial and the spiritual, point only to the latter as an undoubted actuality. As to the terrestrial life, owing to its changeability and shortness, it is nothing but an illusion of our senses. Our life in the spiritual spheres must be thought an actuality because it is there that lives our endless, never-changing immortal I, the Sûtrâtmâ. Whereas in every new incarnation it clothes itself in a perfectly different personality, a temporary and short-lived one, in which everything except its spiritual prototype is doomed to traceless destruction."

"But excuse me, Thakur. Is it possible that my personality, my terrestrial conscious I, is to perish tracelessly?"

"According to our teachings, not only is it to perish, but it must perish in all its fulness, except this principle in it which, united to Buddhi, has become purely spiritual and now forms an inseparable whole. But in the case of a hardened Materialist it may happen that neither consciously nor unconsciously has anything of its personal I ever penetrated into Buddhi. The latter will not take away into eternity any atom of such a terrestrial personality. Your spiritual I is immortal, but from your present personality it will carry away only that which has deserved immortality, that is to say only the aroma of the flowers mowed down by death."

"But the flower itself, the terrestrial I?"

"The flower itself, as all the past and future flowers which have blossomed and will blossom after them on the same maternal

branch, Sûtrâtmâ, children of the same root, Buddhi, will become dust. Your real I is not, as you ought to know yourself, your body that now sits before me, nor your Manas-Sûtrâtmâ, but your Sûtrâtmâ-Buddhi."

"But this does not explain to me why you call our posthumous life immortal, endless, and real, and the terrestrial one a mere shadow. As far as I understand, according to your teaching, even our posthumous life has its limits, and being longer than the terrestrial life, still has its end."

"Most decidedly. The spiritual Ego of the man moves in eternity like a pendulum between the hours of life and death, but if these hours, the periods of life terrestrial and life posthumous, are limited in their continuation, and even the very number of such breaks in eternity between sleep and waking, between illusion and reality, have their beginning as well as their end, the spiritual Pilgrim himself is eternal. Therefore the hours of his posthumous life, when unveiled he stands face to face with truth and the short-lived mirages of his terrestrial existences are far from him, compose or make up, in our ideas, the only reality. Such breaks, in spite of the fact that they are finite, do double service to the Sûtrâtmâ, which, perfecting itself constantly, follows without vacillation, though very slowly, the road leading to its last transformation, when, reaching its aim at last, it becomes a Divine Being. They not only contribute to the reaching of this goal, but without these finite breaks Sûtrâtmâ-Buddhi could never reach it. Sûtrâtmâ is the actor, and its numerous and different incarnations are the actor's parts. I suppose you would not apply to these parts, and so much the less to their costumes, the term of personality. Like an actor the soul is bound to play, during the cycle of births up to the very threshold of Paranirvâna, many such parts, which often are disagreeable to it, but like a bee, collecting its honey from every flower, and leaving the rest to feed the worms of the earth, our spiritual individuality, the Sûtrâtmâ, collecting only the nectar of moral qualities and consciousness from every terrestrial personality in which it has to clothe itself, forced by Karma, unites at last all these qualities in one, having then become a perfect being, a Dhyân Chohan. So much the worse for such terrestrial personalities from whom it could not gather anything. Of course, such personalities cannot outlive consciously their terrestrial existence."

"Then the immortality of the terrestrial personality still remains an open question, and even the very immortality is not unconditioned?"

"Oh no, you misunderstand me," said the Master. "What I mean is that immortality does not cover the *non-existing*; for everything that exists in Sat, or has its origin in Sat, immortality as well as infinity, are unconditioned. Mulaprakriti is the reverse of Parabrahman, but they are both one and the same. The very essence of all this, that is to say, spirit, force and matter, have neither end nor beginning, but the shape acquired by this triple unity during its incarnations, their exterior so to speak, is nothing but a mere illusion of personal conceptions. This is why we call the posthumous life the only reality, and the terrestrial one, including the personality itself, only imaginary."

"Why in this case should we call the reality sleep, and the phantasm waking?"

"This comparison was made by me to facilitate your comprehension. From the standpoint of your terrestrial notions it is perfectly accurate."

"You say that the posthumous life is founded on a basis of perfect justice, on the merited recompense for all the terrestrial sorrows. You say that Sûtrâtmâ is sure to seize the smallest opportunity of using the spiritual qualities in each of its incarnations. Then how can you admit that the spiritual personality of our Babu, the personality of this boy, who is so ideally honest and noble, so perfectly kind, in spite of all his disbeliefs, will not reach immortality, and will perish like the dust of a dried flower?"

"Who, except himself," answered the Master, "ever doomed him to such a fate? I have known the Babu from the time he was a small boy, and I am perfectly sure that the harvest of the Sûtrâtmâ in his case will be very abundant. Though his Atheism and Materialism are far from being feigned, still he *cannot* die for ever in the whole fulness of his individuality."

"But, Thakur Sahib, did not you yourself confirm the rectitude of his notions as to his personal state on the other side of the grave, and do not these notions consist in his firm belief that after his death every trace of consciousness will disappear?"

"I confirmed them, and I confirm them again. When travelling in a railway train you may fall asleep and sleep all the time, while the train stops at many stations; but surely there will be a station where you will awake, and the aim of your journey will be reached in full consciousness. You say you are dissatisfied with my comparison of death to sleep, but remember, the most ordinary of mortals knows three different kinds of sleep—dreamless sleep, a sleep with vague chaotic dreams, and at last a sleep with dreams so very vivid and

clear that for the time being they become a perfect reality for the sleeper. Why should not you admit that exactly the analogous case happens to the soul freed from its body? After their parting there begins for the soul, according to its deserts, and chiefly to its faith, either a perfectly conscious life, a life of semi-consciousness, or a dreamless sleep which is equal to the state of non-being. This is the realization of the programme of which I spoke, a programme previously invented and prepared by the Materialist. But there are Materialists and Materialists. A bad man, or simply a great egotist, who adds to his full disbelief a perfect indifference to his fellow beings, must unquestionably leave his personality for ever at the threshold of death. He has no means of linking himself to the Sûtrâtmâ, and the connection between them is broken for ever with his last sigh; but such Materialists as our Babu will sleep only one station. There will be a time when he will recognize himself in eternity, and will be sorry he has lost a single day of the life eternal. I see your objections—I see you are going to say that hundreds and thousands of human lives, lived through by the Sûtrâtmâ, correspond in our Vedântin notions to a perfect disappearance of every personality. This is my answer. Take a comparison of eternity with a single life of a man, which is composed of so many days, weeks, months, and years. If a man has preserved a good memory in his old age he may easily recall every important day or year of his past life, but even in case he has forgotten some of them, is not his personality one and the same through all his life? For the Ego every separate life is what every separate day is in the life of a man."

"Then, would it not be better to say that death is nothing but a birth for a new life, or, still better, a going back to eternity?"

"This is how it really is, and I have nothing to say against such a way of putting it. Only with our accepted views of material life the words 'live' and 'exist' are not applicable to the purely subjective condition after death; and were they employed in our Philosophy without a rigid definition of their meanings, the Vedântins would soon arrive at the ideas which are common in our times among the American Spiritualists, who preach about spirits marrying among themselves and with mortals. As amongst the true, not nominal Christians, so amongst the Vedântins—the life on the other side of the grave is the land where there are no tears, no sighs, where there is neither marrying nor giving in marriage, and where the just realize their full perfection."

SEARCHERS FOR TRUTH

MANY are the claims to the title of "searcher for truth." The sincerity of the claimant, however, can be judged by one criterion. When he discovers that which has all the earmarks of truth, is he willing to put it into practice—*even if it hurts*? Illusions of every kind, however agreeable, are shunned by the man who endeavors to live life honestly. No man wants to be fooled by another, but many are satisfied to fool themselves.

The familiar objections to reincarnation show how willingly men live in a world of fancy and unreality fabricated by wishful thinking. For instance, Reincarnation is not true because we do not want to come back. To pray is a virtue because we want to get something for nothing. Do not the fiction-reader and the movie-goer usually welcome the temporary delusion of believing the story real—of seeing in the hero or heroine a realization of their own all too human ideals? What kind of pleasure is it that requires such delusion as the condition of its enjoyment? Are all pleasures of this sort? Too often we suppose that a "good time" can be had only by sinking to the intellectual and moral level of the race-mind; "relaxation," this is sometimes called, but what is relaxed? It is possible to pass through the pleasures of life without dulling for the time our discrimination, nor does this require the cessation of enjoyment. The soul is the enjoyer as well as the admonisher. A "sense of fitness" is not the least of our soul-powers. H. P. B. explains in the *Key* (p. 37, orig. ed.) the common tendency to seek pleasure in the Lethe of personal forgetfulness: "Selfishness is essentially conservative, and hates being disturbed. It prefers an easy going, unexacting *lie* to the greatest truth, if the latter requires the sacrifice of one's smallest comfort." When a man's actions are based on his likes and dislikes, against his better judgment, he is simply saying: "I do not want the true, falsehood is more palatable."

Unfortunately, an illustration is only that; illustrations can never provide more than single instances of the principle they are used to illuminate. Hence the tendency to derive *rules* of conduct from illustrations, instead of mastering the principle itself. As the *Gita* says, "the path which is not manifest is with difficulty attained by corporeal beings." Thus it might be supposed that theosophists frown upon the reading of fiction, or regard going to the movies as a capital sin. Or, because it is said that the right attitude of mind should be maintained at all times, that the student on a holiday

should pause at decently spaced intervals to ask himself—or worse, ask others—"Now what is the 'lesson' here?" If the spirit of which such a habit would be a dead form does not rise spontaneously in the mind, and we need have recourse to a moralizing instead of a moral tone of thought, then something is dreadfully wrong somewhere.

W. Q. J. has said, "Try to see in each event a deep occult significance." This means, above all, to be *natural.* Being natural, for beings with a dual nature, is the most difficult thing in the world. A perfectly natural man is the flower of evolution. No natural man ever offended free spirits with his Calvinistic tendencies; nor did he ever seem to justify self-indulgence in the things which are "natural" to the lower nature. A natural man is an impersonal man; he never speaks of good and evil from a personal point of view because he knows the soul is impersonal and can only be affronted by such speech; the natural man discusses moral problems in terms of law, to which the soul responds for it has been addressed in its own language. The personal man condemns some actions as vicious, approves others as virtuous, while the impersonal man deals in the realities of law which is beyond both vice and virtue. But as Teacher, he may illustrate the law in personal terms, that the personal man may mount to impersonality, first rising on the ruins of vices overcome, and finally, on virtues transcended—he forever forgets they are "his" virtues.

One of the most important tests a man meets is his willingness to sacrifice personal attachment for an impersonal and more universal relation. Reason and intuition tell him that it is limiting and selfish to confine his attention and devotion exclusively to his family and friends, but the love of the many, at first, may appear cold and unremitting. Human nature hungers for personal attention and a warm response. The personal man never asks the question, Who is more fortunate, the man who has a mere handful of friends, or the man who is a friend to thousands? The rarest gift, poets tell us, is to have a trusted friend. Many search sadly all their lives, never to meet in the eyes of another that sympathetic glow of heart-light. Is it then foolish to work toward that age when the whole of humanity will be our friends, when we would help a stranger on the street as freely as a lifelong companion?

But let us remember the fine line between the attitude of *soul,* held continuously through life's joys as well as its labors, and those strained and unnatural *forms* of conduct followed by those whom the *Gita* calls "false pietists of bewildered soul." If we sever the

bond with an old friend because he is not "spiritual," as we would be, we do but forge chains of another kind, subtler, and far harder to break because closer to the plane of causation. This is different from allowing old connections to die a natural death because their continuance dissipates the time and energy we would give in the service of our fellows. When the phrase, "Motive is everything," no longer sounds trite to our ear, then the portal to the Path of the Unmanifested stands builded before us, and we discover its architect in ourselves.

Does working impersonally in a universal Cause mean that man loses his individuality thereby? Our present sense of individuality is but the smallest glimmer of the nature of true individuality. We identify ourselves with one small fragment of the whole and make our judgments accordingly. Can we say that the man who has identified himself with the whole of humanity has become less by so doing? As the flaming solar orb may be compared to a rush-light, so may the sense of individuality of the Perfected Man be compared to the personal consciousness of the average mortal. The Master is indeed a Universal Being in the fullest sense of the word.

If, then, we want the truth unalloyed, we must be willing to act upon it wherever it may lead. To say that Brotherhood is a fact in nature and to commit the heresy of separateness; to say this is a universe of law and then try to make up its "laws" to suit ourselves; to say that the purpose of life is to learn, and fail to face ourselves as we truly are—to do these things means to forfeit our right to the title of "searcher for truth." No more treacherous and insidious form of hypocrisy is to be found, for it dwells in hidden places beyond the sight and ridicule of men.

The man who wants the truth is the one who lives it. He honors every truth by use.

Distributive Karma

It is held as a truth among Theosophists that the interdependence of Humanity is the cause of what is called Distributive Karma, and it is this law which affords the solution to the great question of collective suffering and its relief. It is an occult law, moreover, that no man can rise superior to his individual failings, without lifting, be it ever so little, the whole body of which he is an integral part.

—*The Key to Theosophy.*

YOUTH-COMPANIONS' FORUM

IF justice is the keynote of the universe, every apparently unjust misfortune man suffers can be explained as a punishment for some previous act in a former physical existence. But how can there be justice in the case of an infant death, when the ego has no knowledge of having been deprived of that particular life?

It must always be borne in mind that Karma is the law of harmony. As expressed in the *Aphorisms:*

> Karma is both merciful and just. Mercy and Justice are only opposite poles of a single whole; and Mercy without Justice is not possible in the operations of Karma. That which man calls Mercy and Justice is defective, errant, and impure. (No. 21.)

On the case of an infant death, another Aphorism gives further light: "Birth into any sort of body and to obtain the fruits of any sort of Karma is due to the preponderance of the line of Karmic tendency." (No. 25.) "The soul is not born, nor does it die; it cannot be called an infant or an adult." Mere babes have no Devachan. There is nothing to hold them in Devachan, and they immediately search for another body until one is found that is suitable.

Much of value on this subject may be had from reading two short articles by Mr. Judge, re-published in THEOSOPHY, Volume XVI, at pages 370-1, "Why Children Suffer" and "Soul Neither 'Adult' Nor 'Infant'."

(*b*) There *is* justice in the case of an infant death, because the *Ego* does have the necessary knowledge. Just as at the moment of death, even when sudden, every man sees the whole of his life marshalled before him, in the same way—

> . . . at the moment he is reborn on to earth, the *Ego,* awaking from the state of Devachan, has a prospective vision of the life which awaits him, and realizes all the causes that have led to it. He realizes them and sees futurity, because it is between Devachan and re-birth that the *Ego* regains his full *manasic* consciousness, and rebecomes for a short time the god he was, before, in compliance with Karmic law, he first descended into matter and incarnated in the first man of flesh. The "golden thread" sees all its "pearls" and misses not one of them (*Key,* p. 163, orig. ed.).

If, then, at the moment of birth the ego has a vision of the coming life, with all the causes that led to it, then the soul must also realize the causes that led to the premature death of the infant form, and any feeling of injustice is out of the question.

But even if the ego did not perceive the death of the baby body, there still could be no injustice. That of which we are not conscious can bring neither sorrow nor joy, and consequently no feeling of injustice is possible. Our sense of justice is the soul's perception of universal law. There is neither justice nor injustice for beings who are not self-conscious.

If light and darkness are the world's eternal ways, must there always be suffering in the world? Was suffering part of the plan?

Theosophy teaches that suffering "need not have been," although the contrasts in nature, such as light and darkness, are necessary for perception. But long exposure to sunlight may cause death, and continued darkness will do the same. Extremes of any kind are the roots of future suffering, but there is no need for extremes. The baker is under no necessity to burn the bread, and the milk need not be spilled from the pitcher. In an early humanity we went to extremes in experimenting with the creative forces of nature; we upset the equilibrium between the higher and lower planes, thus establishing the causes for future misery. Not until we understand the genesis of suffering and our role as its creators can we set about its alleviation.

The spiritual Ego is above pain. As put by Mr. Judge, it sees "the lower personality struggling with these phantoms of earth-life while it . . . enjoys eternal felicity." (THEOSOPHY IV, 30.) If Krishna, the Higher Self, were involved in the pairs of opposites, there would be no hope of escape except through the intervention of some outside power. For some 1,800 years the Western world has believed that man was originally sinful and that he can escape suffering only through some external agent of salvation. It was accepted that suffering is the natural and inevitable lot of man—the dogma which created the idea of Hell and eternal perdition and spread a thick film between the higher intuitions of man and divine verities (*S. D.* II, 484).

Theosophy exposes the falsity of this belief by showing that the inner or real man is a permanent individuality who has personated many characters throughout a long, an almost interminable, series of incarnations (*S. D.* II, 306). The permanent individuality knows at all times that he is not any of the parts he plays. There was a time when the lower personality also had this knowledge, but "through the atrophy of the 'spiritual eye' in the physical body, that knowledge is unable to impress itself on the consciousness of the false personality." (*S. D.* II, 306.) The dimming of the spiritual eye was *unnecessary*. Until man can regain his spiritual sight,

he will continue to suffer, but its restoration will come about through his own self-induced and self-devised efforts, and not through the intervention of any outside power. Theosophy emphasizes the fact that man will not achieve spiritual sight for the first time, but will in the course of evolution *regain* what he has lost. Only the teaching of the original, divine nature of man can destroy the dogma of "original sin and suffering."

If Theosophy is not a religion, what does it offer to the religious feeling in man?

(*a*) It is correct to state that Theosophy is not a religion, but, as H. P. B. says in "Is Theosophy a Religion?" (THEOSOPHY, XI, 57): "It is perhaps necessary, first of all, to say that the assertion that 'Theosophy is not *a* Religion' by no means excludes the fact that 'Theosophy *is* Religion' itself." By "Religion itself" is meant that Theosophy is the foundation of religions. This is well expressed by the term, "Wisdom-Religion," or "Divine Wisdom," which is the literal meaning of "Theosophy." H. P. B. has this to say in "Origin of Religions" (THEOSOPHY, XVII, 69): "It is from this WISDOM-RELIGION that all the various individual "Religions" (erroneously so called) have sprung, forming in their turn offshoots and branches, and also all the minor creeds, based upon and always originated through some personal experience in psychology."

In *The Friendly Philosopher* (p. 211), Mr. Crosbie tells what true religion comprises:

> True religion must give us a basis for thinking, and consequently, a basis for acting; it must give us an understanding of nature, of ourselves and of other beings. Religion is a bond uniting men together—not a particular set of dogmas or beliefs—binding not only all Men, but also all Beings and all *things* in the entire Universe, into one grand whole. Just that basis and that bond are presented in the three fundamental propositions of the *Secret Doctrine*.

Regarding the "religious feeling" of which the question speaks, Mr. Crosbie says (THEOSOPHY XI, 126):

> The desire to know the "whence, where and whither" of humanity springs from the general "religious instincts," the real basis for religion being in man's own spiritual nature. Religion does not arise outside of man, as the word itself shows—from *religere,* to bind back.

If a man knows that religious feeling comes from a soul-perception of the fundamental identity of all beings in evolution, and if he will refer to the Three Fundamental Propositions of the Secret Doctrine, that feeling will find its full and natural expression.

Masters of Wisdom are an ideal he can understand because of the same potentialities in himself. Deity he sees as the One Source of all and in all—the One Life, which is really the only "God," a much misunderstood word. Then, too, a man's feeling of justice is strengthened by studying *principles*; he knows the "whys and wherefores" as given in the twin doctrines of Karma and Reincarnation. Brotherhood, he learns, can be proved as the fundamental law of life because of the inner identity of all the beings in the universe.

Theosophy offers the widest range to the rational nature and to the religious feeling in man because it is both a scientific religion and a religious science, and it is philosophy because it explains. The student has a criterion of truth in the principles of Theosophy in that they give an explanation of the mysteries of life. We should remember the motto of the original Theosophical Society, "There Is No Religion Higher Than Truth." The true religious feeling is expressed in the words of Mr. Crosbie, "To live for others is the foundation and basis of religion, of true spiritual knowledge."

(*b*) What is this innate "religious feeling"? It is man's intuitive perception that his welfare, here, hereafter, and always, is bound up with the welfare of all other beings. Emotional reactions to prevailing religious practices, and the custom of setting aside one day in the week for the consideration of what are called "spiritual ideas," as contrasted with daily duties—these things have nothing to do with real religion.

It is recorded that Cicero pondered the derivation of the word "religion" from *religere,* to bind, the prefix *re* meaning "again," or "back." He wondered when the Romans first used the word. The earlier ancients had no term which meant "religion," as this word was used in Cicero's day, or as as we use it now. Only in a dark age do men think they can separate religious life from daily life. In a brighter age there is a reverence, a truly religious attitude, toward every phase of human activity; men apply themselves to their business life, household life and national life with the same spirit of devotion. The ancient laws of Manu show this to be true. Duty is seen as a precious privilege, and gratitude toward Those who are the source of Truth finds natural expression in the preparation of one's self to teach those who know still less. The Golden Age needs no such religions as are in the world today.

Theosophy is not *a* religion in the current understanding of this word. "The religion of the day is but a series of dogmas man-made and with no scientific foundation for promulgated ethics." This does not mean, however, that Theosophy offers nothing to the

innate "religious feeling in man," for it provides the highest and noblest ethics of which man can conceive. Study and practice of those ideals reawaken man's higher nature; all his relations in life become honorable and wise, and therefore truly religious.

Does not the idea of potential divinity in man tend to make him more egotistical?

(*a*) The Real Man is Atma-Buddhi-Manas. The Atman is the universal divine essence in each one. Its divinity remains potential for individual egos until its vehicle, Buddhi, becomes thoroughly united with Manas *on this plane*. Then we may speak of Buddhi-Manas as the Divine Ego. Realization of our Divinity while on earth in a body is therefore the very opposite of personal Egotism, the false idea of Self. Porphyry, the Neoplatonist, cautions: "Do not defile the divinity with the vain imaginings of men; you will not injure that which is forever blest (Buddhi-Manas); but you will blind yourself to the perception of the greatest and most vital truths." Writing in the *Theosophical Glossary* on *Mahat,* H. P. B. places egotism or the false feeling of "I am I" in lower manas. If man regards himself as the *One* Self, and from that position regards his potential divinity, he cannot be egotistical. This attitude *requires* self-forgetfulness. If, on the other hand, one accepts the ideas of Theosophy in an intellectual way, and does nothing about it—if he fails to realize that to know the doctrine he must live the life—then he is what H. P. B. calls a "nominal" Theosophist. The tragic history of the Theosophical Society shows that many Theosophists did not live the life.

Intellect *per se* is cold and leads to selfishness; it is valuable only as an instrument for the Perceiver centering his consciousness in Buddhi-Manas. If the consciousness is not centered in the divine nature, it must be centered in Lower Manas, and the vagaries of Lower Manas are infinite. We quote from "The Theosophical Mahatmas" (THEOSOPHY, XIV, 132) to show what happens when it becomes the ruling principle of action: "theosophists, outvying political 'rings' in their search for personal power and authority; theosophists slandering and criticizing each other as two rival Christian sects might do; finally theosophists refusing to *lead the life*."

The Voice of the Silence gives the following injunction on egotism: "Self-gratulation, O Disciple, is like unto a lofty tower, up which a haughty fool has climbed. Thereon he sits in prideful solitude and unperceived by any but himself." Then there is this telling paragraph from the same book on the Eternal Path:

> False learning is rejected by the Wise, and scattered to the winds by the Good Law. Its wheel revolves for all, the humble and the proud. The "Doctrine of the Eye" is for the crowd; the "Doctrine of the Heart" for the elect. The first repeat in pride: "Behold, I know;" the last, they who in humbleness have garnered, low confess: "Thus have I heard."

(*b*) Divinity means responsibility, and no other single word so well defines it. How can it make a man egotistical to know that he is responsible for every thought, word and deed? — responsible for present confusion because of past failure to remember his responsible divinity? Egotism is the opposite of divinity. It is personal and selfish and indicates that a man's thoughts are turned toward his own welfare, his own glorification, at the expense of others. Humility is the mark of the strong, the truly divine man. A sense of responsibility makes a man modest.

Since thoughts are causes, the ideas a man holds determine the character of his life. The idea of original sin has served to make men sinful through irresponsibility. How can we help our evil ways when we were "made that way"? The doctrine of inherent divinity brings out a man's noblest qualities by showing him his true relation to life. Instead of thinking of himself as a "person," he comes to realize himself as a universal Being—not separate from his fellows. Instead of concentrating on his personal importance, the responsible man will develop those attributes of divinity manifested in all the Great Teachers of history—modesty and selflessness. They all have said, as H. P. Blavatsky said, "Follow not me, follow the path I show."

Spirit, Mind, Matter

The *Monad* is impersonal and a god *per se,* albeit unconscious on this plane. For, divorced from its third (often called fifth) principle, Manas, which is the horizontal line of the first manifested triangle or trinity, it can have no consciousness or perception of things on this earthly plane. "The highest sees through the eye of the lowest" in the manifested world; *Purusha* (Spirit) remains blind without the help of Prakrit (matter) in the material spheres; and so does Atma-Buddhi without Manas.—*The Secret Doctrine.*

CHANGES IN MODERN THOUGHT

ALTHOUGH the resources of modern thought, whether scientific or generally cultural, are far more voluminous than the materials available for intellectual examination and evaluation in the ninteenth century, there is no denying that the quality of serious literature has suffered a distinct decline since that time. So evident is this general tendency that in a recent university examination for honors, history students were required to account for the fact that there was far more reading of history books several generations ago than there is today. Dealing with a specific aspect of this problem, the modern historian Henry Steele Commager suggests that modern literature has been weakened by its competitive struggle with the faster pace and entertaining attractions of the newspaper, the newsreel and radio. Reviewing the monumental labours of Frank Luther Mott in compiling *A History of American Magazines,*[1] Mr. Commager remarks that a perusal of these volumes is a sobering experience:

> Few will be inclined to challenge the conclusion implicit in these pages; that the magazines of our grandfathers were better edited, better illustrated, more readable, than those with which we solace or instruct ourselves. . . . What magazines today wage war against social and political evils as did the muck-rake periodicals of the Nineties? Where is a weekly journal of opinion to compare with the old Nation, where a monthly as instructive as the old Outlook, where a literary magazine to match the Dial? Who would not trade in his file of any magazine of the last twenty years for any one of a dozen magazine files from the Eighties?

This judgment may well be applied to almost every field of cultural activity, especially to those fields known as the "Humanities." But our loss is greatest in popular writers on scientific discovery. One reason why *The Secret Doctrine* retains its tone of contemporaneity is because the authorities in scientific thought whom H. P. B. quotes at length still tower far above all modern writers on scientific subjects. Indeed, the Huxleys, Spencers and Wallaces all did yeoman service for the Movement in providing intellectual forms which could be used to introduce the ancient philosophy to modern thought. Huxley was no denier of the universal "Tertium Quid"; he recognized the reality of Consciousness, as distinguished from Matter and Force. Again, his intuition led him to say that "from the most rigidly scientific point of view, the assumption that,

[1] New York *Times Book Review,* Jan. 15, 1939.

amidst the myriads of worlds scattered through endless space, there can be no intelligence, as much greater than man's as his is greater than a black beetle's; no being endowed with powers of influencing the course of nature as much greater than his, as his is greater than a snail's, seems to me not merely baseless, but impertinent."[2]

Since the earth is part of the universe, there is no reason why such beings should not exist here; in fact, according to another dissident to the materialism of Huxley's time, Alfred Russel Wallace, the Earth is the only place where they can exist! It is curious how otherwise noble minds remain cramped by theological tradition. What presumption to maintain that in all the infinitudes of space, here alone has nature provided for the evolution of the conscious intelligences we call men! This *reductio ad absurdum* is one of those paradoxes not infrequently found in scientific minds, of which the thought of Professor John Fiske provides another illustration. He wrote a book to prove that our minor planet, member of a minor solar system, is the only place where mankind can exist, drawing the conclusion that therefore we are the crown of cosmic evolution.

The writings of Wallace, however, did much to controvert the materialistic doctrines of his time. His interest in spiritualism was no mere hunger for phenomena, but led him to adopt the philosophical views which belief in invisible intelligences made necessary. His wide knowledge of scientific fact and theory contributed greatly to the force of his arguments, which may be illustrated in a passage taken from *Man's Place in the Universe*,[3] wherein he shows the inadequacy of blind, mechanical causation to account for the development of the organism:

> If the simple growth of the fully formed organism is a mystery, what of this growth of thousands of complex organisms each with all its special peculiarities, yet all arising from minute germs or cells the diverse natures of which are wholly indistinguishable by the highest powers of the microscope? This, too, is said to be the work of protoplasm under the influence of heat and moisture, and modern physiologists hope some day to learn "how it is done." It may be well here to give the views of a modern writer on this point. Referring to a difficulty which had been stated by Clerk-Maxwell twenty-five years ago, that there was not room in the reproductive cell for the millions of molecules needed to serve as the units of growth for all the different structures in the body of the higher animals, Professor M'Kendrick says: "But today, it is reasonable

[2] *Science and Christian Tradition* (New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1896), p. 39.
[3] McClure, Phillips & Co., New York, 1914, pp. 200-203.

from existing data to suppose that the germinal vesicle might contain a million of millions of organic molecules. Complex arrangements of these molecules suited for the development of all the parts of a highly complicated organism, might satisfy all the demands of the theory of heredity. Doubtless the germ was a material system through and through. The conception of the physicist was, that molecules were in the various states of movement; and the thinkers were striving toward a kinetic theory of molecules and of atoms of solid matter, which might be as fruitful as the kinetic theory of gases. There were motions atomic and molecular. It was conceivable that the peculiarities of vital action might be determined by the kind of motion that took place in the molecules of what we call living matter. It might be different in kind from some of the motions dealt with by physicists. Life is continually being created from non-living material—such, at least, is the existing view of growth by the assimilation of food. The creation of living matter out of non-living may be the transmission to the dead matter of molecular motions which are *sui generis* in form." This is the modern physiological view of "how it may be done," and it seems hardly more intelligible than the very old theory of the origin of stone axes, given by Adrianus Tollius in 1649, and quoted by Mr. E. B. Tylor, who says: "He gives drawings of some ordinary stone axes and hammers, and tells how naturalists say that they are generated in the sky by a fulgureous exhalation conglobed in a cloud by the circumfixed humor, and are, as it were, baked hard by intense heat, and the weapon becomes pointed by the damp mixed with it flying from the dry part, and leaving the other end denser, but the exhalations press it so hard that it breaks through the cloud and makes thunder and lightning. But [he says] if this is really the way in which they are generated, it is odd they are not round, and that they have holes through them. It is hardly to be believed, he thinks." And so, when the physiologists, determined to avoid the assumption of anything beyond matter and motion in the germ, impute the whole development and growth of the elephant or of man from minute cells internally alike, by means of "kinds of motion" and the "transmission of motions which are *sui generis* in form," many of us will be inclined to say with the old author—"It is hardly to be believed, I think."

Wallace was in good company in assuming this attitude. Ludwig Büchner's *Force and Matter,* which had enormous popularity during the life of the author, and great subsequent influence, was described by Schopenhauer as "the materialist's bible"—a philosophy fit only for journeyman barbers. Barbers, who were sometimes minor surgeons, represented the half- or quarter-educated class in

[4] *Early History of Mankind,* 2d. ed., p. 227.

Germany. This was a timely rebuke to the growing arrogance of the materialists. A man risked his reputation if he even investigated psychic phenomena, let alone affirm their genuineness. Witness the persecution suffered by Professor Crookes (later Sir William) at the hands of his scientific colleagues, whose criticisms, however, did not deter him from joining the Theosophical Society and remaining a member until his death.

Eduard von Hartmann was denounced as an interloper because he objected to the philosophy of the materialists, or rather their lack of philosophy. He was curtly told that a shoemaker should stick to his last; that a philosopher, a metaphysician, had no business to meddle with physical facts. Hartmann did not answer directly; he was planning a devastating reply. Before long a book appeared by an anonymous author who espoused the cause of materialism with such extraordinary erudition and eloquence that the work was hailed as a valuable support to this position. The author was most cordially invited to join the fellowship of the elect and to continue his contributions. None followed, but before long another book appeared which with equal force and learning annihilated the arguments of the first book! Then Hartmann revealed himself as the author of both books—a revelation which was greeted with eloquent silence.

There were, of course, other scientists who directly or indirectly served the cause of Theosophy, such as Zöllner in Germany, Flammarion in France, and—for a while, at least—Edison in America. But perhaps the most valuable assistance, though doubtless unintentional, came from one who was both scientist and philosopher: Herbert Spencer. An eminent advocate of evolution, Spencer never fell victim to the crass materialism of most of its proponents. Like Huxley, he too recognized a *tertium quid* in the universe; he called it the "Unknowable," discussing this idea in a manner suggestive of the first of the Fundamental Propositions of *The Secret Doctrine.* Also in harmony with Theosophy was his famous definition of evolution, *"Evolution is an integration of matter and concomitant dissipation of motion: during which the matter passes from an indefinite, incoherent homogeneity to a definite, coherent heterogeneity: and during which the retained motion undergoes a parallel transformation."* This statement will bear comparison with a similar definition given by H. P. B. of the "esoteric general outline of evolution": "a descent of Spirit into Matter, equivalent to an ascent in physical evolution; a re-ascent from the depths of materiality towards its *status quo ante,* with a corresponding dissipation

of concrete form and substance up to the LAYA state, or what Science calls 'the zero-point,' and beyond." (*S. D.* I, 620.) It is evident that Spencer formulated but half of the law of evolution—the first half, dealing with the differentiation of form.

While limited in scope, the influence of these philosophers of nineteenth century science has had its effect. They are still read; they still inspire a broader view of nature and nature's forces. The philosophic tradition in science, which in the early decades of this century suffered a sort of pralaya, is gradually being revived. This tendency has received its major stimulation from the slowly emerging implications of the astounding scientific discoveries made at the turn of the century—discoveries predicted by H. P. B. Physics has had to abandon the theory of indivisible, material atoms, and the Nebular Hypothesis of Kant and Laplace has also been discarded. These events have made scientists assume a changed attitude toward philosophy. While not specifically Theosophical, the work of men such as Jeans, Eddington and Whitehead in interpreting physical science, of Driesch and MacBride in biology, of Osborn in anthropology, and McDougall in psychology, has broadened the base of scientific thought and will doubtless aid the younger generation of scientists to throw off old materialism, which may finally become as disreputable as the metaphysical point of view is largely regarded today.

THE PILGRIM-SOUL

Our God *within* us, or "our Father in Secret" is what we call the "HIGHER SELF," Atma. Our incarnating Ego was a God in its origin, as were all the primeval emanations of the One Unknown Principle. But since its "fall into Matter," having to incarnate throughout the cycle, in succession, from first to last, it is no longer a free and happy god, but a poor pilgrim on his way to regain that which he has lost. Such is the destiny of the MAN—the true Ego, not the Automaton, the *shell* that goes by that name. It is for him to become the conqueror over matter.—*The Key to Theosophy.*

ON THE LOOKOUT

Neurology and the Pineal Gland

Dr. William B. Cadwalader, president of the American Neurological Association, in a recent address before that body appealed for more collaboration among the workers in various sciences such as neurology, chemistry, physics, electro-biology, and psychology. (New York *Times,* June 6.) He cited the mystery of the pineal gland as a problem on which such collaboration might give more light, saying:

> The application of insufficiently tested theories and hasty conclusions is as bad in its effects in neurology and psychiatry as in any other branch of medicine, but the damage resulting may often be more difficult to repair.
>
> There are parts of the brain of whose function we know almost nothing. Consider the pineal gland, about which so many fantastic theories have been evolved, and which continues to harass us with its mystery, perched almost inaccessibly in almost the very center of the more vital parts of the brain. The map of the brain as we know it, like the map of the world, is changing. We must remember that in science, advancement would have been impossible with mere accumulation of facts without the association and assistance given by speculative logic.

Occult Physiology

If among the sciences to which Dr. Cadwalader looks for aid, he would include the true Eastern psychology, as set forth in our day in the writings of H. P. Blavatsky and William Q. Judge, he might really learn something of the function and significance of the pineal gland, and of the brain in general as well as other portions of the human anatomy about which modern medicine knows so little. H. P. Blavatsky, after enumerating and explaining the principles which go to make up the *complete* man, wrote in *The Key to Theosophy:*

> Of course no physiologist or biologist will accept these principles, nor can he make head or tail of them. And this is why, perhaps, none of them understand to this day either the functions of the spleen, the physical vehicle of the Protean Double, or those of a certain organ on the right side of man, the seat of the above-mentioned desires, nor yet does he know anything of the pineal gland, which he describes as a horny gland with a little sand in it, which gland is in truth the very seat of the highest

> and divinest consciousness in man, his omniscient, spiritual and all-embracing mind. And this shows to you still more plainly that we have neither invented these seven principles, nor are they new in the world of philosophy, as we can easily prove (p. 121, orig. ed.).

THE THIRD EYE

Does the pineal gland throw any light on neurological and psychiatric problems? A study of the Section entitled, "The Races with the 'Third Eye'," in the second volume of *The Secret Doctrine* will reveal many truths on this subject. The pineal gland was once an "Eye," and is still referred to in occult literature as the "Third Eye":

> If the odd "eye" in man is now atrophied, it is a proof that, as in the lower animal, it has once been active; for nature never creates the smallest, the most insignificant form without some definite purpose and use. It was an *active* organ, we say, at that stage of evolution when the spiritual element in man reigned supreme over the hardly nascent intellectual and psychic elements. And, as the cycle ran down toward that point when the physiological senses were developed by, and went *pari passu* with, the growth and consolidation of the physical man, the interminable and complex vicissitudes and tribulations of zoological development, that median "eye" ended by atrophying along with the early spiritual and purely psychic characteristics in man. (*S. D.* II, 298.)

AN IMPORTANT CORRELATION

Consider also the following passage:

> When we learn that the "third eye" was once a physiological organ, and that later on, owing to the gradual disappearance of spirituality and increase of materiality (Spiritual nature being extinguished by the physical), it became an atrophied organ, as little understood now by physiologists as the spleen is—when we learn this, the connection will become clear. During human life the greatest impediment in the way of spiritual development, and especially to the acquirement of *Yoga* powers, is the activity of our physiological senses. Sexual action being closely connected, by interaction, with the spinal cord and the grey matter of the brain, it is useless to give any longer explanation. Of course, the normal and abnormal state of the brain, and the degree of active work in the *medulla oblongata,* reacts powerfully on the pineal gland, for, owing to the number of "centres" in that region, which controls by far the greater majority of the physiological actions of the animal economy, and also owing to the

> close and intimate neighborhood of the two, there must be exerted a very powerful "inductive" action by the *medulla* on the pineal gland. (II, 295-6.)

If the pineal gland is the very seat of the highest and divinest consciousness in man, and if the abnormal and self-indulgent action of the procreative function affects this center, then may not this point to a leading cause for the neuroticism and general psychic disorders which are characteristic of modern civilization?

On Scientific Method

The recognition by Dr. Cadwalader of the fact that "in science, advancement would have been impossible without the association and assistance given by speculative logic" is a most hopeful sign. He is but repeating, however, the classical statement of Dr. Einstein. Writing on "Physics and Reality" in the *Journal* of the Franklin Institute some three years ago, the great mathematician said: "Physics constitutes a logical system of thought which is in a state of evolution, whose basis cannot be obtained through distillation by any inductive method from the experiences lived through, but can only be attained by free invention." In other words, the *principles* of science have their origin in intuition. Now, in the statement of Dr. Cadwalader, we find this spirit entering the biological sciences, so long restricted from any significant progress by their blind and exclusive adherence to the method of induction. *Every* hypothesis can be shown to trace to some first principle which, search as we may, can never be found in mere sense experience. When scientists as a body realize this fundamental truth of all their activities, materialism will die a natural death, for scientists will have become philosophers. Therefore, Dr. Cadwalader's remarks concerning scientific method are a definite milepost in the progress of modern thought.

Source of Hypotheses

The scientific worshipper of induction ought to ask himself where his hypotheses come from. If he is intellectually honest he will be forced to answer as did the English logician De Morgan:

> A hypothesis must have been started, not by rule, but by that sagacity of which no description can be given, precisely because the very owners of it do not act under laws perceptible to themselves. The inventor of hypothesis, if pressed to explain his method, must answer as did Zerah Colburn [a Vermont calculating boy of the early eighteen hundreds] when asked for his

> mode of instantaneous calculation. When the poor boy had been bothered for some time in this manner, he cried out in a huff, "God put it into my head, and I can't put it into yours."

The authors of *Logic and the Scientific Method,* Drs. Cohen and Nagel, after quoting this passage from De Morgan, proceed to a discussion of the use of *analogy* in the formulation of hypotheses (pp. 221-2). This, carefully read, makes it plain that the writers are in fundamental agreement with H. P. B. that "The law of Analogy is the first key to the world problem." She adds, however, that "these links have to be studied co-ordinately in their occult relations to each other." (*S. D.* I, 604.) And why not? Why should scientists reject the perfectly logical propositions of *The Secret Doctrine,* when their own theories have for their ultimate origin a source which is admittedly inexplicable so far as modern science itself is concerned? For her great work, all that H. P. B. claimed was that "its logical coherence and consistency entitle this new Genesis to rank, at any rate, on a level with the 'working hypotheses' so freely accepted by modern science. Further, it claims consideration, not by reason of any appeal to dogmatic authority, but because it closely adheres to Nature, and follows the laws of uniformity and analogy." (Preface, viii.) What scientist could ask a fairer presentation?

SCIENCE OF TOMORROW

Statements like those of Dr. Einstein and Dr. Cadwalader, and the intelligent treatment of the problems of hypothesis and method in the recognized text of scientists *qua* scientists, are the necessary steps which must be taken before *The Secret Doctrine* can become the textbook of future generations. This is clear from the various statements of H. P. B. respecting the intellectual development of races and nations, particularly that on page 442 of volume II:

> No great truth was ever accepted *a priori,* and generally a century or two passed before it began to glimmer in the human consciousness as a possible verity, except in such cases as the positive discovery of the thing claimed as a fact. The truths of today are the falsehoods and errors of yesterday, and *vice versa.* It is only in the XXth century that portions, if not the whole, of the present work will be vindicated.

MORE BOY-BABIES AFTER WAR

In the April number of the *Statistical Bulletin* issued by the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, the fact that following a

war there is an immediate increase of boy-babies in the participating nations is noted, discussed, and left unexplained. As the writer concludes:

> All in all, the facts are perplexing. It cannot be said that the problem is solved. The increase in the ratio of male births after prolonged wars is an established fact. Its explanation for the time being remains something of a mystery.

The first attempt to account for the phenomenon was made 200 years ago by Johann Suessmilch, who ascribed it to the "interposition of Divine Providence in compensation for the great slaughter of male lives in battle." This theory comes closer to the truth than any of the later explanations, if for Providence we read "Law," by which Nature restores her disturbed equilibrium. A more recent theory supposes that for some reason undernourished women give birth to a greater proportion of boys, on the assumption that war often causes extreme privation at home. However, if malnutrition of mothers is the cause, we should expect to find the same increased ratio of male births following in the wake of famines such as occur periodically in certain regions of India. But the *Statistical Bulletin* reports that careful research has failed to discover any such effect.

Young Mothers Have More Boys

Another theory suggests that the abundance of male births is related to the increased proportion of first births, which are predominantly male, as the result of the consummation of marriages by young couples after the war is over. The writer comments:

> Such an effect, in so far as it corresponds to reality, would be connected with the influence of the age of the mother on the sex ratio of the infants born, for first births occur in the majority of cases among young mothers. . . . The ratio of males to females at birth diminishes as the age of mothers increases. This is especially evident in the case of our native white women, with whom the relative surplus of boy babies shows a consistent decline with advancing age of the mother. . . At the first outbreak of hostilities the young male population is drawn for service into the armed forces at the front, and it is this vigorous body of young men that forms the bulk of the fighting forces throughout the war. Consequently, during hostilities the young women of warring nations are largely prevented from bearing children either through the absence of their young husbands in the army or because no eligible young bachelors are at home for them to marry. Accordingly, so it is reasoned, most births in wartimes are borne by the older married women, with whom boy babies are relatively less common. With the return of the young men

> at the end of the war, there is a marked increase in marriages and births and, since these are predominantly among young adults, it is only natural that the ratio of boy babies should show a decided rise after a war. At first sight this theory accords well with the facts. It is noted that the rise in the proportion of male births has been observed chiefly after wars of long duration. . . . But the matter is not so simple . . . if an increase to above normal in the ratio of male to female births resulted from the return of the soldiers, then their absence during the War should have resulted in a ratio below normal, and the rise to above normal at the end of the War should have been abrupt. But, in point of fact, there was no reduction during the War, and no sudden rise upon the return of the soldiers to civil life. On the contrary, all through the War there was practically a steady increase. . . .

"HOW" AND "WHY"

These theories attempt to understand the *modus operandi* of the increase instead of considering *why* there should be this tendency to restore the balance between the sexes. In *The Ocean of Theosophy,* Mr. Judge says that "whenever there occurs a great number of deaths by war, pestilence, or famine, there is at once a rush of souls to incarnation, either in the same place or in some other place or race." (Pp. 77-8.) It might seem "metaphysical" to a sociologist to consider a race as a living organism in which a unified pattern of evolution is being fulfilled, but only on this view is it possible to understand the *intelligence* displayed by nature in replacing the male bodies destroyed by the slaughter of war. As famine strikes women and men alike, there is in this case no organic *need* for an excess of male over female births; hence, after famine the ratio between the sexes remains normal, a fact noted by the *Statistical Bulletin.* Ignorant of the law of cyclic incarnation, for races as for individuals, scientists are bound to meet with inexplicable anomalies in their endeavor to explain population phenomena through facts learned from statistical observation. Thus, while in the case of a war engaged in by a rising nation, the male birth rate would in that country be accelerated, a people moving toward extinction might experience no such increase in males following a war, its egos seeking birth in some other quarter of the globe, the women, meanwhile, becoming sterile. This is the common sense meaning the Theosophist would see in facts which the scientific statistician must remain unable to understand in terms of natural law. He sees the facts, but his conception of law is limited, hence inapplicable.

Outraged Nature

Dr. Hugh H. Bennett, chief of the Soil Conservation Service of the U. S. Department of Agriculture, recently told the House Labor Committee that about 100,000,000 acres of crop land, some of it of the best, are "completely finished" as a result of soil erosion. (New York *Times* April 24.) This represents an area greater than Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, and all of the New England States except Maine, combined. Every day, as a result of erosion, he said, land equivalent to 200 forty-acre farms is ruined forever. He told the committee that the loss over one year amounts to enough to take care of 365,000 persons who could make at least part of their living on the soil that is washing and blowing away. The annual direct cost of soil erosion to farmers alone, not counting damage to reservoirs, stream channels, irrigation ditches, highways and railways, he placed at $400,000,000, and the damage of the past fifty years was estimated at $20,000,000,000. If the present rate of erosion is permitted to continue, the next fifty years will cost just as much. Dr. Bennett drew from his own experience the picture of Nature ravaged by human greed:

> When I was making a soil survey in Alabama in 1904 [he said], much of the Black Belt was still rich, black soil, but two years ago, after two days' driving I was unable to find a single place where any of the original topsoil was left, and in many places not only had the topsoil washed off, but the brown clay subsoil had washed off also, down to the white chalk. Probably it would require nature somewhere from twenty to thirty thousand years to build back the rich black soil from this parent material, this third layer of the original soil which has been bared during the course of 75 or 100 years of cultivation.

"Good Earth" Gone

Although the U. S. Government is today doing more than ever before to check soil erosion, Dr. Bennett believes it will take from twenty to thirty years of continuous effort to get the danger under control. But if such an effort is not made, the people of the United States may one day find themselves living in a land not unlike China, where practically all the forests, except in the very remote hinterlands, disappeared long ago, so that the denuded hilly and mountainous regions are unfit for any kind of agriculture and the plains are subject to terrible floods. America is not the only modern country so threatened. Conditions in South Africa, Australia, and

in Canada to some extent, are similar. General Jan Smuts said a few years ago that soil erosion overshadowed in its urgency all the complex political problems confronting South Africa. In the London *Daily Telegraph* of Sept. 30, 1937, an article describes the excessive erosion in South Africa:

> Over wide areas the porous topsoil has gone, and instead of being absorbed, the rain runs off the surface, carving huge gullies in the land, and finds its way into the sea, where it deposits its heavy load of soil. The underground water level is falling, wells are drying up, supplies of water for irrigation schemes and towns far from the eroded regions are threatened. Fifty years ago parts of the veld were reported to be too damp for pasturage; today they are arid deserts, broken up by deep gorges and gullies. It is freely admitted in South Africa that the land has been wrongly managed and mercilessly exploited, but nobody foresaw the consequence, and no other practicable course than that taken was possible with the knowledge available, when the country was opened up.

The writer of this article remarks that Australia, too, is faced with the problem, relating that an "Australian expert who recently visited the United States stated that erosion, though not so extensive in Australia, was taking place much more rapidly there than in America."

LUNAR DESOLATION

Unfortunately, improvident squanderers of Nature's bounty are not given to study, otherwise their attention might be directed to the work of an American writer of the last century, George P. Marsh, whose large volume, *The Earth as Modified by Human Action,* written in 1874, might pave the way to an appreciation of the law of Karma. Following is a passage that serves in both retrospect and prophecy:

> The ravages committed by man subvert the relations and destroy the balance which nature had established between her organized and her inorganic creations, and she avenges herself upon the intruder, by letting loose upon her defaced provinces destructive energies hitherto kept in check by organic forces destined to be his best auxiliaries, but which he has unwisely dispersed and driven from the field of action. When the forest is gone, the great reservoir of moisture stored up in its vegetable mould is evaporated, and returns only in deluges of rain to wash away the parched dust into which that mould has been converted. The well-wooded and humid hills are turned to ridges of dry rock, which encumbers the low grounds and chokes the

> watercourses with its débris, and—except in countries favored with an equable distribution of rain through the seasons, and a moderate and regular inclination of surface—the whole earth, unless rescued by human art from the physical degradation to which it tends, becomes an assemblage of bald mountains, of barren, turfless hills, and of swampy and malarious plains. There are parts of Asia Minor, of Northern Africa, of Greece, and even of Alpine Europe, where the operation of causes set in action by man has brought the face of the earth to a desolation almost as complete as that of the moon; and though, within that brief space of time which we call "the historical period," they are known to have been covered with luxuriant woods, verdant pastures, and fertile meadows, they are now too far deteriorated to be reclaimable by man, nor can they become again fitted for human use, except through great geological changes, or other mysterious influences or agencies of which we have no present knowledge, and over which we have no prospective control.

Experience a Hard School

> The earth is fast becoming an unfit home for its noblest inhabitant, and another era of equal human crime and human improvidence, and of like duration with that through which traces of that crime and that improvidence extend, would reduce it to such a condition of impoverished productiveness, of shattered surface, of climatic excess, as to threaten the depravation, barbarism, and perhaps even extinction of the species (pp. 43-4).

Wanton waste of natural resources will inevitably lead the offending ones to future lives of endless drudgery. Schliemann told of holes which the inhabitants of Malta cut in the naked rocks of their island, so that, after fourteen years, dust carried across the Mediterranean from Libya by the African sirocco, and caught in the holes, would accumulate in sufficient quantity for cultivation. The steep terraces of the Island of Teneriffe, Mr. Marsh relates, are covered with soil painfully scooped out from fissures in and between the rocks which have been laid bare by the destruction of the native forests. In China, too, he says, "rock has been artificially covered with earth to an extent which gives such operations a real geographical importance." (Pp. 629-30.) Men sometimes wonder why so much of their lives is engrossed with wresting from the world a bare subsistence; why the wolves of poverty, want, and disease are always so close to the door. The reasons are all too evident, if one will look.

CENSUS OF RELIGIOUS BELIEFS

James H. Leuba, known for his publication of the results of an interrogation of nearly 1,000 students between eighteen and twenty years of age, in which he sought to determine their idea of God, has published (in the *Survey Graphic* for April) the results of a similar questionnaire which was sent to four classes of people: bankers, all other business people, lawyers, and writers, as these callings are represented in *Who's Who in America*. The questionnaire had two parts:

I *Concerning God:—*

1. I believe in a God to whom one may pray in the expectation of receiving an answer. By "answer" I mean more than the natural (subjective, psychological) effect of prayer.
2. I do not believe in God as defined above.
3. Although I do not believe in God as defined above, I believe that there is outside and above man a Power of a spiritual or mental nature.
4. I have no definite belief regarding this question.

II *Concerning belief in continuation of the person after death in another world:—*

1. I believe in
   (a) Personal immortality for all men.
   (b) Conditional immortality for those who reached a certain state of development.
   [In the tabulation of the answers, (a) and (b) were counted as believers.]
2. I believe neither in conditional nor unconditional immortality of the person in another world.
3. I have no definite belief regarding this question.

BANKERS FAVOR "GOD"

The questions were not sent to all the persons listed in the four groups mentioned, but to one-fifth of the names in each—a sufficient number to give an accurate idea of the whole, provided "sampling errors" are avoided. Commenting on the results, Dr. Leuba says:

> One of the most striking results of these statistics is the enormous differences between certain groups. Twice as many bankers as writers believe in the God of the churches: 64 per cent against 32 per cent! The difference between them is almost as large for immortality: 71 per cent against 40 per cent. The business people and the lawyers stand practically at equality: 53 per cent for each regarding God; and 62 per cent and 59 per cent, respectively, regarding immortality.
>
> Let me introduce here, for the sake of comparison, the figures referring to the more distinguished scientists (those whose names

are starred in "American Men of Science") in the statistics of 1933. Believers in God: physicists, 17 per cent; sociologists, 13 per cent; biologists, 12 per cent; psychologists, 12 per cent. Believers in immortality (keeping the same class order): 20 per cent; 10 per cent; 15 per cent; 2 per cent. . . .

A Guess at the Heavenly Population

What may be said in explanation of the enormous lead of the bankers over the writers, and of their still larger lead over the scientists? Bankers are more commonly supposed to constitute a strongly conservative group, they are the bulwark of the present economic system. The traditional Christian religion itself is a powerful support of the existing order, for it places among its important commands obedience to established authority and readiness to accept one's lot on earth, however hard it may be, in the expectation of heavenly compensation.

As to most writers and scientists, their dominant tendency is to look, with appreciating curiosity, beyond the existing order to something better. They are not so sure that the present economic theories and practices are the best; and that the ancient religious convictions, because they have so far accompanied the rise of civilizations, cannot be improved upon.

Are we to see in these peculiarities, differentiating the bankers from the writers and the scientists, an explanation of the figures under discussion? It seems so. One who should suppose that belief in God and immortality leads to heaven, might well stand aghast at the glimpse he gets here of its population: almost no great scientist, few writers, a large contingent of lawyers, and a crowd of bankers!

What Are "Christian" Ethics?

Dr. Leuba's study is valuable because of his sympathetic interest in the problem of religious beliefs, and because of his long and careful investigation in this field. He points to the futility of conducting inquiries about religion without clarifying what is meant by "religion." A man who defines religion as "devotion to the highest good" has a view quite different from the orthodox believer, yet both might call themselves "religious," or be so regarded by others. His questionnaire, therefore, seeks to measure belief in the traditional "God of our Fathers" who responds to supplicatory prayer, and belief in the more generalized doctrine of personal immortality. The results of his study, which show that as intelligence waxes, belief wanes, lead him to conclude: "The task before humanity seems to be to rescue religion and the Christian ethical ideal from their

traditional connection with an idea of the ultimate Power in disagreement with modern knowledge." Someone should point out to Dr. Leuba that the "traditional connections" of Christian ethics are what makes them Christian. Christianity has no unique ethical doctrine. The modern world may abstract from Christian dogma its kernel of moral principles, but this will be of small use without a logical frame of metaphysics as the rational support of ethics for intelligent men.

"PARADISE LOST" WRITTEN AS FICTION

The explanation of the strongly contradictory elements in John Milton's thought, noted in Lookout for June, is to be found in the statement of H. P. B. respecting *Paradise Lost:* "John Milton, first a Puritan and finally a Quietist and Unitarian, never put forth his great work except as a work of fiction," The bloodthirsty passage reproduced in THEOSOPHY for June (pp. 379-80) is from *Of Reformation in England,* Milton's first controversial production, published in 1641 when he was thirty-three years old. It reflects the condemnatory zeal of his then Puritanical outlook. Thirty-two years later, in 1673, a year before his death, he wrote a pamphlet, *Of True Religion,* in which his complete change to a spirit of toleration is revealed. In his last years he belonged to no religious communion and attended no church, even omitting religious observances in his family.

Paradise Lost, although written as an allegory, thoroughly dovetailed together the different parts of Scripture. The effect of Milton's great work on the Anglo-Saxon world shows the great harm that may result from "artistic" materializations of metaphysical doctrines. This was doubtless one of the reasons why Plato politely dismissed the poets from his ideal Republic. As H. P. B. says:

> This drama of *Paradise Lost* comprises the unformulated belief of English-speaking "evangelical Protestant Christians." Disbelief of its main features is equivalent, in their view, to "denying Christ" and "blaspheming against the holy Ghost." If John Milton had supposed that his poem, instead of being regarded as a companion of Dantes *Divine Comedy,* would have been considered as another *Apocalypse* to supplement the *Bible,* and complete its demonology, it is more than probable that he would have borne his poverty more resolutely, and withheld it from the press. (*Isis Unveiled* II, 502.)